

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14, 17-22, 25-30, and 33-36 are pending in the present application, Claims 1, 18, 25, and 33-36 having been amended, and Claims 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 18, 25, and 33-36 is found for example, in Claims 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7, 12-14, 17-29, and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sampson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624, hereinafter Sampson) in view of Barbash et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,595, hereinafter Barbash); and Claims 8-11, 15-16, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sampson in view of Barbash, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092, hereinafter Ferguson).

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 1 overcomes the outstanding ground of rejection.

Claim 1 is directed toward an electronic service system, including: a first server system configured to carry out communications with client systems of electronic service users and to provide electronic services as a main site, and a second server system configured to carry out communications with the first server system and the client systems and to provide the electronic services as a partner site of the main site. The first server system includes: a first server authentication processing unit configured to carry out authentication with the second server system, and an updating unit configured to carry out a remote updating of contents of tie-up pages which present at least part of contents or a framework of the main site as inherited from the first server system at the second server system, at a prescribed

timing when the authentication succeeds. The second server system includes: a second server authentication processing unit configured to carry out authentication with the first server system, at a time of receiving the remote updating, a tie-up page unit configured to maintain the tie-up pages, and an original page unit configured to maintain original pages of the partner site.

Sampson and Barbash, taken alone or in proper combination, do not teach or suggest every element of Claim 1.

The outstanding Office Action takes the position that both the “first server system” and “the second server system” of the claimed invention correspond to the Protected Servers of Sampson; particularly Protected Server 104 (104A) and Protected Server 112 (104B), respectively. To support this position, the outstanding Office Action relies on col. 3, lines 10-15 of Sampson, which recites “a plurality of first servers each controlling access by one of the plurality of clients to resources of a plurality of second servers.” However, in Sampson, the “first server” described in col. 3, lines 10-15 corresponds to the Access Server, and the “second server” described in col. 3, lines 10-15 corresponds to the Protected Server.¹

Thus, col. 3, lines 10-15 of Sampson does not support the position taken in the outstanding Office Action that Protected Server 104 (104A) and Protected server 112 (104B) correspond to the claimed “first server system” and “second server system.”

Furthermore, with regard to the first and second server authentication processing units of the claimed invention, even if Protected Server 104A and Protected Server 104B correspond to the first server system and the second server system, *Sampson provides no description or suggestion of what the “Authentication Mechanism 422” in col. 9, lines 4-13 authenticates.*

¹ See, Sampson, Abstract, and Col. 4, lines 45-57.

Furthermore, with regard to the claimed "updating unit," to more clearly describe and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed "tie-up pages." Tie-up pages are pages which present at least part of contents or a framework of the main site *as inherited from the main site server system*. On the other hand, regardless of the amendment, Sampson does not provide a description of "updating" in col. 8, lines 25-27, col. 9, lines 10-11, col. 12, lines 7-10, col. 13, lines 24-26 as relied upon by the outstanding Office Action.

Furthermore, Barbash does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in Sampson, as Barbash does not describe or suggest a unit that maintains tie-up pages.

In view of the above-noted distinction, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 (and Claims 2-14 and 17) patentably distinguish over Sampson and Barbash, taken alone or in proper combination. Amended Claims 18, 25, and 33-36 are similar to amended Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18, 25, and 33-36 (and Claims 19-22 and 26-30) patentably distinguish over Sampson and Barbash, taken alone or in proper combination, for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\JW\214303US\214303US_AM DUE 3-9-06.DOC